



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/757,202	01/14/2004	Tung-Ching Tseng	2002-0350/24061.484	3558
42717	7590	09/01/2005	EXAMINER	
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP 901 MAIN STREET, SUITE 3100 DALLAS, TX 75202			DEO, DUY VU NGUYEN	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				1765

DATE MAILED: 09/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/757,202	TSENG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DuyVu n. Deo	1765	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 January 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 14 January 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/6/04, 4/15/04</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-11, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee et al. (US 2003/0166381 A1).

Lee describes a method for polishing a shallow trench isolation substrate comprising: providing a substrate having a plurality of patterned regions; polishing the substrate with a first slurry until partial planarization occurs; continuing to final polishing with a second slurry (paragraphs [0088-0089]).

Referring to claims 5, 7, 11, 14 the first and second slurry has 0.5-2.0 w% of ceria such as 1.0 w% (paragraph [0063]; claim 11).

Referring to claim 10, the polishing stop layer includes silicon nitride (paragraph [0077]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1765

4. Claims 6, 13, 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee.

Unlike claimed invention, Lee doesn't describe the initial polishing comprises a control of polishing time so as to avoid over-polishing of a stop layer. However, he suggests leaving some of the polished oxide layer on the polishing stop layer (paragraph [0088]). Therefore, one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would find it obvious to control the polishing time in order to leave some of the polished oxide layer on the polishing stop layer.

5. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Cheng et al. (US 6,638,866).

Unlike claimed invention, Lee doesn't describe the STI comprises a polysilicon layer. Cheng describes a same method for forming STI having a polysilicon layer (col. 2, line 35-46). It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to modify Lee in light of Cheng because Cheng teaches to use the polysilicon layer in order to form a buffer layer (col. 2, line 35-46).

6. Claims 4, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Kubota et al. (US 6,429,134).

Referring to claims 4 and 12, Lee suggests the abrasive for the first slurry include silica (paragraph [0034]). Unlike claimed invention, he doesn't suggest the silica is 10-20 w%. Kubota describes a first slurry for the polishing of the STI substrate wherein the silica concentration is 10 w% (col. 4, line 60-63). It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention, in light of Kubota, to form the first slurry having the silica concentration of 10w% because Kubota suggests the first polishing conditions, which includes the first slurry having a 10w% silica, can be different from the second polishing step and he

further teaches the silica concentration that is silent in Lee. This would form a first slurry that polish the oxide layer with a reasonable expectation of success.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DuyVu n. Deo whose telephone number is 571-272-1462. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00-2:30 Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nadine Norton can be reached on 571-272-1465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Primary Examiner
Duy-Vu N. Deo
8/29/05

